

# **Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)**

## **Meeting Minutes**

*(Approved by Council December 7, 2001)*

**August 29, 2001**

8:40 to 11:55 a.m., East Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building  
700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho

The August 29, 2001 meeting of the Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) was held in the East Conference Room of the Joe R. Williams Building, 700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho.

### **CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME**

Pam Ahrens, Council Chairman, who welcomed members and guests present, called the meeting to order.

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### **Members/Designates Present:**

Mrs. Pam Ahrens, Chairman  
Mr. Eric Beck, Agency IS Representative  
Mr. Dwight Bower, Agency Executive Office  
Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho Senate  
Dr. Gregory Fitch, State Board of Education  
Mr. Ken Harward, Local Gov. Representative  
Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Jones, Rural Rep.  
Mr. Karl Kurtz, Agency Executive Officer  
Mr. Roger Parks, Private Industry Representative  
Mr. John Peay, Judicial Representative  
Mr. J.D. Williams, State Controller  
\*Mr. Rich Mincer, Department of Education  
\*Major Dave Rich, Idaho State Police

\*Designate

#### **Absent Members:**

Representative Lee Gagner, Idaho House  
Dr. Marilyn Howard, Department of Education  
Representative Bert Marley, Idaho House  
Senator Clint Stennett, Idaho Senate  
Colonel Ed Strickfaden, Idaho State Police

#### **Others Present:**

Mr. Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff  
Ms. Dena Duncan, Department of Administration  
Mr. Rich Elwood, ITRMC Staff  
Mr. Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff  
Mr. Don Fournier, ITRMC Staff  
Ms. Emily Gales, ITRMC Staff  
Ms. Merideth Hackney, State Controller's Office  
Ms. Ann Heilman, Division of Human Resources  
Ms. Maureen Ingram, Legislative Services Office  
Mr. Kevin Iwersen, Dept of Administration  
Ms. Ann Joslin, Idaho State Library

Mr. Micheal Key, Idaho State Police  
Mr. Mark Little, Division of Purchasing  
Ms. Allison McClintick, Governor's Office  
Ms. Melody Rose, Division of Human Resources  
Mr. Jeff Shinn, Div. of Financial Management  
Mrs. Connie Spofford, ID Industrial Commission  
Ms. Nancy Szofran, State Board of Education  
Mr. Rick Townsend, Advantech, LLC  
Mr. Riger Widuec, SARCOM  
Mr. Steve Wilson, Idaho Tax Commission  
Ms. Jeannine Wood, Legislative Services Office  
Mr. Charlie Wright, Dept. of Health and Welfare

## MOTION TO APPROVE JUNE 20, 2001 MINUTES

**Karl Kurtz moved and Mary Elizabeth Jones seconded a motion to approve the June 20, 2001 ITRMC Meeting Minutes, and the motion passed unanimously.**

## DISCUSSION

**Rich Mincer**, State Department of Education, advised that for about two years now, the state's Council for Technology in Learning (ICTL) had been discussing the use of a lightweight laptop for students. Sony Corporation had developed such a tool – the **Sony Vio SR33**. Mincer went on to describe features of the laptop, and advised that its education price, including some software, was \$900. Sony planned for this unit to be wireless by December 2001.

---

At the June 20, 2001 ITRMC meeting, Mr. Mincer described a video, featuring the Twin Falls school district, that served as an example of how to integrate technology into the middle school classroom, especially math and science. (Intel Corp. chose to distribute the video, “**Wild Ride**”, to all education centers nationally.) Mincer offered copies of the video to ITRMC voting members.

State Controller J.D. Williams inquired as to whether MicronPC had developed a product comparable to the Sony Vio. Mr. Mincer advised ICTL had been meeting with MicronPC for over two years, informing its representatives of the desire for such a product. Samsung, which actually made MicronPC's laptops, did have a product like the Sony Vio, but it was only sold in Europe at that time. Williams advised Idaho's elected officials would soon be meeting with MicronPC, and that this might be a subject to bring up. Mincer noted he had recently spoke with the company's new vice president, along with his entire staff, regarding this product. MicronPC was considering putting the similar Samsung product “back on the roadmap”.

## DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Chairman Pam Ahrens invited **Ann Heilman** to speak to the Council regarding the Division of Human Resources' new **information technology (IT) hiring process**. Ms. Heilman advised that since the employment picture for high-tech jobs in Idaho had been changing, the current system used by the Division of Human Resources (DHR) for IT recruitment must change. Heilman provided background information on the state's past recruitment and retention challenges. One concession the old personnel system made was ‘Critical Recruitment Status’ for about ten select IT professional positions. This meant that agencies could accept resumes and hire on the spot if the applicant was deemed qualified. According to a recent Division of Financial Management (DFM) newsletter, Idaho had about 1,000 different IT jobs that had been subject to layoff in Idaho's high-tech industries. The good and bad news was that when the job market was ‘hot’, state jobs “pale in comparison” due to less opportunity for the compensation typically offered in private industry. However, when the job market reversed, state jobs were much more attractive because of job security, good benefits, no fear of a merger, etc.

In July, DHR received 110 applications for one network analyst position; and the volume of applications across the board seemed to be averaging more than ten. As administrator, Heilman was responsible for ensuring DHR was in compliance with state law, including a new law (July 1<sup>st</sup>)

strengthening the veteran's preference requirement. This law required that any disabled veteran be placed at the top of an employment register. Therefore, there was a whole new pool of people who were eligible for higher consideration.

**DHR would reengineer its method of recruiting for IT jobs**, maximize the electronic transfer of job applicant information, and make sure state laws were honored. The Division was using mostly resumes, rather than tests, in its considerations; and agencies would have immediate authority to interview anyone desired. The only risk was that a person being interviewed by an agency would need to 'screen out' into the top ten, but there was nothing that would prevent the person from being interviewed, Heilman said. The Department of Labor had been working extensively with DHR to develop a whole new applicant processing system. One feature was that anyone could apply on-line, and agencies can immediately access all applicant information. Testing on this process was expected to be complete by November 15, 2001.

## **Discussion**

On behalf of the IT managers throughout the state, **Eric Beck**, Department of Labor, expressed feelings of anxiety that changes introduced by DHR would provide some problems for them; IT managers were anxiously awaiting the opportunity to acquire talent from the pool available, including those laid off.

**Senator Hal Bunderson** raised the question of how to deal with Mr. Beck's concern. Ms. Heilman advised the merit system was fairly structured in that, by law, all applicants must receive some sort of score, which did cause slow-down in the hiring process. The veteran's preference issue caused another slow-down. Perhaps, said Heilman, DHR needed to look at whether certain-level IT jobs should be classified due to rapid changes in the field.

Mr. Beck noted that, after making changes to the IT hiring process, DHR staff had been very responsive to priority items/concerns raised by the Department of Labor.

Chairman Ahrens added that in the past, particularly with Y2K, the ITRMC went out on a limb to ensure the professionals needed were obtained and retained. Also, it would be helpful for DHR to recognize the nature of rapidly changing technology in the area of IT professionals, especially for retaining purposes.

## **TAX COMMISSION**

Chairman Ahrens introduced Steve Wilson of the Tax Commission to speak on the **CATS (convert all tax systems) project**. The Tax Commission was then currently in the middle of this extensive IT project to convert all of its tax processing systems from a legacy system (a 20-year-old technology) to a modern client-server architecture and relational database. On January 1, 2001, the Commission released its first three tax types in the new software. In February, the Commission appeared before JFAC (Joint Senate Finance – House Appropriations Committee) to request funding for the last year of the project, to report that the project was on time and budget, and the software was more than meeting the Commission's expectations. On July 1<sup>st</sup>, the Commission had its largest rollout of tax types (permit-based taxes), and had had two successful rollouts to date.

Wilson then gave some background information on the project. Since the Tax Commission's legacy systems were proprietary and did not meet ITRMC standards and guidelines, Tax Commissioners and agency managers decided it was time for a change. First, an independent IT consultant was brought in to do a study. That consultant made ten recommendations to the Tax Commissioners, all of which were accepted. The Commission also consulted with its peers in other states to learn what was being done with regard to the modernization of other systems. Finally, the Commission consulted a number of technology companies. The Commission then made infrastructure improvements, realizing that if a new system was to be brought in, there needed to be a solid foundation to place it on. Therefore, the first request made of the governor and legislature for funding was for wiring network and communications infrastructure.

By the fall of 1999, the Commission was ready to attempt to procure a new system, and began writing an RFP (request for proposal) for a traditional design/build project. (Under a design/build model, an RFP was released; a vendor was brought in to build a custom system, programming it from the ground up.) Around that time, Gartner released a statistic stating only 15% of these types of IT projects were considered successful. In October 1999, the Commission became aware of **GenTax®**, a Microsoft-centric product. Fast Enterprises, the makers of GenTax®, claimed that GenTax® was the first commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software designed specifically for revenue jurisdictions. (In a COTS product, important base functionality already exists.) The Tax Commission, along with Jan Cox (Division of Purchasing), was invited to British Columbia to visit the Ministry of Finance, where GenTax® was being installed for the first time. This led to a recommendation being made to and accepted by the Commission's IT Steering Committee to acquire the GenTax® product. With the help of the Division of Purchasing, a license agreement was signed with Fast Enterprises to configure GenTax® to meet Idaho's needs.

A COTS implementation was a fast prototyping model that allowed for changes to be made quickly. This allowed the Commission to focus on its business and the maximization of the use of the software, and to leverage its considerable existing investments. In talking with other states, the Commission found that none had done a complete tax system modernization for less than \$40 million, and in fact, most spent much more. Including the infrastructure improvements mentioned above, the Idaho Tax Commission's tax system modernization would cost less than \$15 million. Also, the Commission planned to release all of its tax types in the new software in less than two years. (With a traditional design/build project for a state revenue department, the average completion time was four years.) One other advantage to using a COTS product was that it would be upgraded when the vendor made improvements to the product, under the terms of the Commission's maintenance agreement. (Ongoing maintenance on the software would cost less than the Commission was then currently paying on its legacy systems.)

By implementing a COTS product, the state Tax Commission had given up a lot of control. In some cases, existing business processes needed to be modified to fit the software, a difficult thing to do. Fortunately, the Commission had not had to compromise very much because, unlike the old legacy system, the new software was very flexible.

Mr. Wilson spoke briefly about how the Commission managed the project. In talking with British Columbia and other jurisdictions that had already worked through this type of project, the Commission learned that the people issues were often the most difficult to manage in a large IT project. Many lessons were learned as the Tax Commission carried out this project. Its goal was for every member of the Tax Commission to have a high level of confidence in the software after the project was complete.

## **Discussions**

Wilson advised Senator Hal Bunderson that it was believed the Tax Commission would have much greater capability to provide the legislature and other stakeholders with information relative to making judgment on Idaho's economic outlook. By moving information into a relational database, the Commission was able to analyze and separate data.

---

The Commission was looking at this project as an enterprise data model, and would unplug the legacy systems when the conversion was complete. When the project was finished, the Commission hoped to have a truly integrated tax system, Wilson said.

---

In the event that Fast Enterprises encountered financial difficulties, the Tax Commission's license agreement allowed for the State of Idaho to assume ownership of the source code, which was in escrow.

## **WORK GROUP UPDATE**

### **SATAD (Secure Access to Applications and Data) Work Group**

Chairman Ahrens called on J.D. Williams to give a SATAD Work Group update. Since May 2001, SATAD members had tried to analyze what was available (and looked at best practices) with regard to PKI (Public Key Infrastructure) technology in order to establish policies to be adopted by ITRMC, and eventually develop an RFP based on the policies. Two sub-work groups had been set up under SATAD dealing with a digital certificate policy and an RFP. What SATAD was proposing was technology-neutral and involved only the best, standard practices and technologies of industry and government. Though SATAD had tried to keep the process moving along, it also involved Attorney General staff as early as possible due to legal ramifications that could occur. Williams noted the SATAD Work Group was made up of a fine group of people who were dedicated to taking advantage of electronic government and the benefits of digital access to data, etc. In order to implement the work of the SATAD Work Group, adoption of the proposed ITRMC IT Policy 4010, Digital Certificates and Public Key Infrastructure, was required.

## **MOTION TO APPROVE ITRMC POLICY 4010**

Don Fournier, ITRMC Staff, presented a brief discussion of Policy 4010. ITRMC IT Policy 4010, Digital Certificates & Public Key Infrastructure, was the framework for a formal, 50 to 60-page PKI policy. Authority came from the statute via this policy and would enable a formal PKI policy to be developed.

**J.D. Williams moved and Eric Beck seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Policy 4010, Digital Certificates & Public Key Infrastructure, contingent upon legal review, and the motion passed unanimously.**

## **Discussion**

Mr. Williams made mention of electronic pay stubs. The State Controller's Office had decided to leave the decision as to the utilization of electronic pay stubs (when available) up to each agency. There was a significant cost-savings to view pay stubs on-line rather than have them hand delivered.

## **Metatag Work Group**

Chairman Ahrens asked John Peay, Idaho Supreme Court, to report on ITRMCs Metatag Work Group activities. The Metatag Work Group had encountered the challenge of staying within the scope of its project: to identify metatags that would enhance the visibility and availability of state-developed Web sites to the public in general. Metadata goes well beyond identifying information found on the Internet, and could be extended into records management, archival capabilities for electronic information, and so on. This area requires considerably more technical expertise than what was available in the Metatag Work Group, said Peay, and the issues may extend beyond metadata into the question of what was technically considered the official document. The Work Group opted to refer issues relevant to records management to Bobbie Eckerle (Division of Purchasing), who was in charge of the state records management group, and an expert in this regard. This would give members of the Historical Society and state archivists the opportunity to thoroughly analyze standards and procedures in this respect. Mr. Peay then referred to **Enterprise Standards 5000 – Information and Data, Category 5110, Metatags**. Metatags listed in this standard represented the recommended metatags accepted by the Work Group. These tags would help citizens find specific information by improving the capabilities of the state's Internet search engine. They were generic and did not lock the state into one set of metadata, such as the Dublin Core, and would allow information to be made more readily available. The implementation of metatags would require some additional work on the part of webmasters.

The work of the Metatag Work Group was not complete, according to Peay, Co-chair. At the next scheduled meeting, the group would discuss training for those who performed Web site development throughout the state. The group would also explore the use of tools that may reduce the amount of work required, and had spoken with Access Idaho regarding the development of Java script that may facilitate the placement of metatags. If the Council adopted these metatags, the state's search engine would be modified to utilize them. Also, this standard should be included in a structured, periodic standards review, as this issue would certainly resurface in the future.

## **STATE IT PLAN**

Chairman Ahrens asked **Rich Elwood**, Statewide IT Coordinator, to address the Council. Mr. Elwood briefly updated the Council on the April 25<sup>th</sup> discussion of the State IT Plan Revision process. The ITRMC Staff had performed the following with respect to the **IT Plan Revision**: completed the Assessment Phase, reviewing the existing documents (plan, policies, standards) and identifying important items to include in the Plan revision; developed a vision and direction for the IT Plan; and designed a format for the finished documents. Elwood explained that the documents presented before the Council for approval were living documents, and revisions to policies and standards would come over time, as required. The ITRMC Staff hoped the Plan itself would provide the consistent direction in which the state needed to move, and that it would be able to accomplish the goals outlined therein. A number of agencies were involved during the course of the Plan revision and had received draft copies of the documents. (Positive feedback was received and

incorporated into the documents.) Also, the Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Administration had reviewed the entire document, including policies and standards. Elwood noted that the accomplishments made over the past several years as a result of Council presence and activity made it possible to move forward with a new vision and initiatives. He then discussed **five opportunities** for the state: implement ‘one government’; leverage information technology as a strategic asset; provide secure access and confidentiality; expand participation in digital government; and recruit and retain a proficient IT workforce. The goal with these opportunities was to move services toward Idaho’s citizens. Ultimately, our goal was a citizen-centric government for Idahoans, who were not only consumers of government services but were shareholders, Elwood said. The State IT Plan was a framework and vision that set a direction and should not require modification each year. Mr. Elwood proceeded with the review of the State IT Plan and Policies with the Council.

## Discussion

Senator Hal Bunderson inquired as to any interface accessidaho.org had with FirstGov (U.S. government home page). There was a hyperlink to firstgov.org from accessidaho.org and vice versa. Also, FirstGov had built a database to search Idaho’s web pages from firstgov.org.

---

Governor Kempthorne’s statewide broadband initiative/assessment was discussed briefly.

---

John Peay noted that technically, we have the capacity to allow for the electronic filing of court records, and such records could include an inventory of one’s personal assets. He questioned who was responsible for determining if this information should be made available electronically to anyone with access to the Internet. Also questioned was whether or not someone who wishes to dissolve his/her marriage (with no other choice than to go to a public agency to do so) forfeits his/her right to a certain amount of privacy. Peay warned that, in our race to make our government digitally available, we may be beginning to expose information that perhaps the public doesn’t expect or necessarily want to be public.

Rich Elwood advised that, from a citizen’s perspective, he absolutely would not want such information available to the public. From a technology perspective, though, the issue of security was highlighted. Legislation was dealing with this issue appropriately; and the technology was dealing with it in accordance with that legislation so that a citizen making a filing recognizes that the same security over it exists whether it was in paper or electronic form. Therefore, as we move forward with the initiative taken with digital certificates, for instance, it behooves us to be absolutely certain that we are in harmony with statutes and the right to privacy, said Elwood. The technology was not the issue. How people deal with that technology, and what they do with it, was the issue. We as people need to ensure that we are accommodating citizens’ expectations and the law.

J.D. Williams noted Peay raised a very fundamental question about what was happening. Williams advised that the governor and legislature would be leading the decision in the area of public records in a digital age. Because of the digital nature of information, the aggregation of it was going to be profound. There must be some restrictions, but it was such that it was going to be a very high-level public policy. This can very well be done by congress because of the interstate commerce clause of

the constitution and the nature of these transmissions. Williams noted that congress was also wrestling with this issue. There were no easy answers, but he believed as a government, we must ensure what is considered secure really is secure, and that those who should have access to personal identifying information do. These issues were very well outlined in the State IT Plan, said Williams.

Senator Bunderson noted that any restriction of a public document would impose a different level of censorship than the statute allows, and decisions made in this area may be influenced directly by actions at the federal level. Legislatively, we would have to deal with what was public and what was not, he said.

Eric Beck found the State IT Plan to be a very good document. He also noted that at the time of the Council's formation, there was no such vision and this was a vast improvement over the state's position at the time.

Chairman Ahrens suggested the Council might best serve itself by reviewing the document on a regular basis. Rich Elwood noted that statute required the Council review and publish an IT plan on an annual basis. The policies would be reviewed at any point in time when something changed – environment, technology, need, etc. The standards themselves called for a review cycle that could be set based on the type of technology, etc. It was hoped that the IT Plan was visionary, but general enough that it did not have to be re-written every year. New things would be on the horizon as other initiatives were in place.

Dwight Bower, Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), noted a lot of good work had been done to develop the Plan. He then suggested the use of a more operative word in place of 'Carefully': Page 3, III, first bullet "*Carefully evaluate secured access...*". Elwood advised the Staff chose the word 'carefully' because of the process currently underway with the SATAD Work Group. There were a lot of choices to be made, and because the ramifications were so significant, we needed to be cautious in how we make those choices, Elwood said. In terms of this being an ongoing issue (secured access to applications, etc.), evaluation should not end simply because it was initially done carefully, Bower said. Perhaps 'continually' might be a better word, said Chairman Ahrens.

Senator Bunderson suggested the word 'Fully' be dropped from page 3, IV, first bullet "*Fully implement the shared...*".

### **MOTION TO APPROVE THE STATE IT PLAN FOR ADOPTION**

**Dwight Bower moved and Ken Harward seconded a motion to adopt the State Information Technology Plan, provided that the word 'Carefully' was changed to 'Continually' (page 3, III, first bullet) and the word 'Fully' was dropped (page 3, IV, first bullet), and the motion passed unanimously.**

### **ITRMC IT POLICIES**

Rich Elwood provided an introduction. The policies were an appendix to the State IT Plan. Seven policies were adopted over the years by the Council, which would be identified along with any changes recommended. There were six additional new policies reflecting current needs to be addressed. The policies had been put into a consistent format: the structure of the policy number



had been changed to allow for the grouping of policies by category, and flexibility in the numbering scheme itself. Elwood further explained policy format.

## **1000 – General Policies**

Policy **1010, Information Technology Standards and Guidelines Framework**, was originally Policy 2000-01, Standardization. It had been revised to become a framework policy to establish standards and guidelines, and the exemption process had been brought out of Policy 1997-01 into the framework. Policy 1010 not only identified the need for and authority of standards through policy, but also formalized the process that put it into the context for exemption. The four standards formerly included in the Standardization Policy had been moved into the Enterprise Standards section.

Policy **1020, Privacy Notice**, was a new policy establishing the need for a privacy notice on all higher-level state Web pages. For consistency, this policy contained a privacy notice, which had been reviewed by the Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Administration, Access Idaho and others. It was a minimum-level policy, and there may be other elements of it that could be modified to be agency-specific, if required.

Policy **1030, Electronic Document Management**, was the former Policy 1998-01. It needed some additional work, but in the interest of time, had been moved into the new format. The majority of the policy was essentially guideline; in the future, it would be modified, and the guidelines moved into the proper area. The ITRMC Staff would be working with the records retention professionals mentioned earlier. When this policy was opened up for review, the archiving issue (image and electronically filed records) – strategy, length, necessity to continue, refreshing the data, etc. – would be addressed.

Policies **1040, Employee Electronic Mail and Messaging Use; 1050, Employee Internet Use; and 1060, Employee Personal Computer Use** were new policies. Then existing Executive Order 98-05 signed by Governor Batt referenced some minimum standards, and that ITRMC may establish more in-depth and detailed standards. There was a new executive order pending before the governor at that time, and the ITRMC Staff had made every effort to work with DHR and the Deputy Attorney General to ensure that, to the extent that could be, these policies reflected the elements of the executive order as it existed and the new executive order as it was proposed. It was necessary to establish policies with greater explanations and detail in such a way that could be used on a statewide basis.

Policy 1040, ‘Policy’, paragraph ‘G’, “*Individual use of the E-mail...*”, referred to requests received from time to time by the Department of Administration to perform a review of access through the servers managed by the Department. Though there were technical issues related to this item, Eric Beck recommended the monitoring of messages themselves be the agencies’ responsibility, with the option to contact the Department of Administration for further assistance. This item should be changed to read “*at the request of the agency, Department of Administration staff would...*”.

Dwight Bower questioned whether the ITRMC Staff had reviewed individual department policies in place dealing with these areas. In addition to the proposed executive order, only two department policies have been reviewed. As a result, the policy was consistent with DHR, elements of the Department of Administration’s policy, and the governors’ executive orders.

Mr. Elwood was not certain of the timeline on the governor's pending executive order, but there was a statement in the existing Executive Order 98-05 that the items contained within the order were a minimum standard and that the ITRMC may set standards in more detail covering the subjects. Furthermore, DHR and the Department of Administration's Deputy Attorney General had reviewed it. The Staff's inquiries in fact prompted the review of the pending executive order to go to a higher level of priority than it was otherwise.

With regard to electronic messaging, Ken Harward noted there was an implication that there was an ability to monitor traffic. The purpose of the review by the Deputy Attorney General's office was to ensure that what was stated in the policy was covered with regard to ramifications that would be involved based upon the open records law, which stated that there should not be an expectation on behalf of state employees. It also stated that everything received via e-mail was private. Further, there were several references to the law in the policy, and the AGs office was comfortable with the wording.

There was more discussion regarding the monitoring of electronic mail, the retention and imaging of electronic documents, and retention laws.

In Policy 1050, 'Policy', paragraph 'L', Dwight Bower questioned who "*Certain authorized individuals...*" referred to. Bill Farnsworth of the ITRMC Staff, for instance, was responsible for reviewing linkages from accessidaho.org to ensure they were correct. Policy 1050 recognizes that in carrying out his/her responsibility as an authorized person, an individual such as Mr. Farnsworth may occasionally arrive at a site that was totally inappropriate for viewing by state employees (as was the case when someone hacked into the City of Caldwell's Web site and redirected traffic to a pornographic site). Such authorized individuals would not be in jeopardy of violating the policy by carrying out his/her responsibility. So, 'authorized individuals' referred to someone within an agency who had been given this responsibility, said Elwood. It was indicated in the policy that if a user accidentally entered an inappropriate site, it should be reported to their supervisor. This policy was designed for the individual, and further screening was up to the agency. Perhaps that point needed to be more specific. Hal Bunderson suggested the word 'Certain' be dropped from this item, as it was redundant. Then it might read, 'individuals authorized by the department head...certain job responsibilities may...'. Dwight Bower wanted to ensure that it was at least provided that any agency wanting the opportunity to purchase software on the front end for blocking/screening purposes may do so, consistent with their work or monitor. Chairman Ahrens reiterated that this policy deals with *employee* Internet use, and that an employer policy to address Bower's concerns may need to be established. J.D. Williams mentioned the use of state-owned computers to obtain on-line payroll stub information. There was an executive order issued that covered this, among other things, Ahrens said.

Policy 1060 referred to policies 1040 and 1050 as being elements of the proper use of state-owned personal computers and further identifies the password issue, as well as other information about how passwords should be protected. Policies 1040, 1050 and 1060 should be approved as a group. Changes made to these three policies were a result of meeting with DHR regarding DHR's policy covering the areas discussed. DHR was also involved in the development of the governor's pending executive order.

## **MOTION TO APPROVE POLICIES 1010, 1020 AND 1030 FOR ADOPTION**

**Karl Kurtz moved and Dwight Bower seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Policy 1010, Information Technology Standards and Guidelines Framework; ITRMC IT Policy 1020, Privacy Notice; and ITRMC IT Policy 1030, Electronic Document Management, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Due to suggested changes and the limited review time by Council members, consideration of policies 1040, 1050, and 1060 was deferred to the next Council meeting.

### **2000 – Information Technology Planning Policies**

Policy **2010, Information Technology Planning Process**, was the revision of Policy 1997-02. It was basically the same policy, with updated timeline information. Its intent was to clarify elements of the statute named in the then existing policy.

Policy **2020, Business Recovery Planning**, was a new policy reflecting the need to develop business recovery plans for those agencies that had responsibility for managing servers or mainframe computers. These business recovery plans should be submitted to ITRMC with the agency's annual IT plan. If we are advertising to our citizens that we will be available for serving their needs 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, we need to make sure that we have plans in place to make that happen, said Elwood. The business recovery planning process put focus on the problems relating to that issue.

Policy **2030, IT Major Project Review**, then existing Policy 1997-02, called for a major IT project review. This had been put into a separate policy that basically included the same information as in Policy 1997-02. The ITRMC Staff would be in the process of establishing some new guidelines that would relate to the format of the project outline.

Policy **2040, Risk Assessment**, was a new policy. The statute was changed to reflect the need for risk assessment as part of any project review by agencies, and the Staff was working with the Legislative Services Office (LSO) in supplying the same type of model used in LSOs audits to agencies up front. This policy established that need and the submission of it as part of IT project/plan review. A guideline would be offered at a later date to incorporate an automated tool to support the Risk Assessment model.

## **MOTION TO APPROVE POLICIES 2010, 2020, 2030 AND 2040 FOR ADOPTION**

**Ken Harward moved and Karl Kurtz seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Policy 2010, Information Technology Planning Process; ITRMC IT Policy 2020, Business Recovery Planning; ITRMC IT Policy 2030, Information Technology Major Project Review, and ITRMC IT Policy 2040, Risk Assessment, and the motion passed unanimously.**

### **3000 – Telecommunications Policies**

Policy **3010, Telecommunication Switching and Long Distance Services**, then existing Policy 1997-03, was moved forward without change, with the exception of time-dependent elements.

Eric Beck pointed out that the original purpose and intent was not obvious or apparent. The 'Abstract' referred to voice communication; the 'Policy' itself referred to voice; and the second paragraph under 'Policy' began to discuss data, which was contained under Policy 3030. Voice and data were both discussed under 'Intent'. As far as the policy was concerned, it would need some work. Per Chairman Ahrens, it should be reviewed within the next six months.

Policy **3020, Connectivity and Transport Protocols**, then existing Policy 1997-04, also underwent minor revisions with regard to timeline and format.

Policy **3030, Wide Area Networks (WAN)**, then existing Policy 1997-05, underwent minor revisions with regard to timeline and format, as well.

Eric Beck mentioned there was a blurring of the line between LAN (local area network) and WAN, and suggested this policy be reviewed within six months.

### **MOTION TO APPROVE POLICIES 3010, 3020 AND 3030 FOR ADOPTION**

Eric Beck moved and J.D. Williams seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Policy 3010, Telecommunication Switching and Long Distance Services; ITRMC IT Policy 3020, Connectivity and Transport Protocols; and ITRMC IT Policy 3030, Wide Area Networks (WAN), provided they be reviewed for revision within the next six months, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **ITRMC STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

In the interest of time, ITRMC Enterprise Standards and Guidelines would be discussed at ITRMCs October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **DISCUSSION**

Ken Harward suggested the review and update of the **IT Acronyms/Glossary of Terms**, of which acronyms and terms were used throughout the policies.

### **BRIEF UPDATES**

#### **2001 Digital Government Boot Camp**

Mr. Elwood presented a sample of the ITRMC IT Achievement Award that would be given out at the Awards Luncheon on October 25<sup>th</sup>. **Twenty-seven nominations** were submitted in six of eight categories. Roger Parks, ITRMC member, had agreed to serve as chair of the nomination review committee. Also discussed was the possibility of involving some local CIOs (chief information officers) in the evaluation, and perhaps a member of the legislature. Elwood encouraged Council members to register for the 'Boot Camp'.

Chairman Ahrens advised that the Legislative Interim Committee on Electronic Commerce would meet to coincide with the 'Boot Camp', and those members would be in attendance. Also, information should be distributed to school districts encouraging participation.

Partnership had been established with Oracle and Hewlett-Packard, and the Staff was still in negotiations with several other major corporations to assist in sponsoring the event.

## **Emerging Developments**

The ITRMC Staff felt there was a need for a **state IT security plan** and would be proposing (by year's end) to the Council a process for such a plan. Security was becoming extraordinarily critical for the state, and because of the potential number of cyber attacks, the Staff felt it important to coordinate efforts as a State through a plan to ensure the State was as secure as possible.

## **HIPAA**

Karl Kurtz offered an update on the **Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)**. The clock was running on HIPAA at the Department of Health and Welfare (H&W); there were a number of projects associated with it, and those individuals involved were extremely concerned about the completion dates. For **electronic data interchange**, H&W must have its assessment and remediation completed by October 2002. Estimated cost to do this was \$9-10 million. Issues surrounding **privacy** affect electronic transmission of any/all health information. H&W recently made a presentation to a group of 50-60 state employees, and there was a project underway to deal with this issue. There was no cost estimate of remediation at that time. The third aspect of HIPAA was **security**. Whatever would be performed in this area would have a big impact on things done through firewalls and all information as it related to digital certificates. There was also a significant impact across state government, including schools, colleges and universities. H&W was continually trying to bring those involved up-to-date. As the state moves more toward digital government, the need to invest more resources into access and reliability should be heightened.

Kurtz also mentioned H&W received a 'Best of Breed' national government recognition for its electronic transfer of funds applications. These applications save H&W about \$700,000 per year.

## **IDANET**

Chairman Ahrens invited John Olson, Project Manager from DITCS (Division of Information Technology and Communication Services), to give an update on the IDANET initiative. Mr. Olson explained that the main switches had been acquired – three Cisco 8540s, which were being tested under a trial basis. One switch would be installed in Lewiston, one in Coeur d'Alene, and one in Ada County, providing backbone for the network. Testing and training (DITCS, ITD, Idaho universities, and others) would occur during the first and second weeks of September; a decision had to be made by September 19<sup>th</sup> as to whether to keep the switches. There were currently three bids involving IDANET that were either on the street or recently off the street. 1013 was the bid for the Backbone optical carrier circuits. The Region 1 Bid, 1009, closed August 28<sup>th</sup>. There was a bid on the street for a five-year lease with two, two-year renewal options, allowing leasing opportunities for equipment not currently held. The Backbone, incidentally, had received three bids with an award pending. The Region 1 Bid, consisting of the seven northern-most Idaho counties, closed August 28<sup>th</sup>. One bid was received, for which no evaluation had been performed as of yet.

Chairman/ Ahrens had named an oversight committee; its first meeting was scheduled for September 11<sup>th</sup>. That committee was to provide oversight for the IDANET effort, particularly in the operations center (once established). This committee would rely on a technical advisory committee made up of technicians from various agencies. Together the two committees would oversee the operations of IDANET and its various components in the long term. So far, the most amazing thing about IDANET was the tremendous cooperation and coordination between state departments, said Olson. Further, Dwight Bower and staff have been particularly instrumental.

Once a decision had been made with regard to implementation of Region 1, the bid process for Region 2 (north-central Idaho) would begin.

The Internet is a key component of IDANET, and the universities were being asked how they might provide the Internet connectivity needed throughout the state. There were several other opportunities and possibilities to be considered, as well.

ITD had received responses to its two RFPs on the use of fibre optic cable on interstate right-of-way (I-90 and I-84). Dwight Bower explained the significance of the RFPs.

### **PC Leasing Program**

Chairman Ahrens asked Mark Little, Division of Purchasing, to discuss the state's PC (personal computer) Leasing Program. Mr. Little advised the program encompassed IT leasing, and Cisco switches could be leased as well as PC's. A three-year contract was in place with **Eplus** (the state would also be able to leverage contracts already in place). Under the program, agencies could return PC's to the company in which they were leased after three years. The Division recently completed a Purchasing seminar for this part of the state, where Purchasing agents were briefed on the availability of the program. Information/procedures can also be found on the Division's Web site, <http://www2.state.id.us/adm/purchasing/index.htm>.

### **NEW BUSINESS / ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Ahrens advised of upcoming Council meeting dates – October 17<sup>th</sup> (one-hour teleconference), October 25<sup>th</sup> (Digital Government Boot Camp), and December 7<sup>th</sup>.

As there was no other new business to come before the Council, Chairman Pam Ahrens thanked those in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m. The next ITRMC meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 17, 2001 from 8:30 - 9:30 a.m. in the East Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gales  
ITRMC Assistant